Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/941,282	CHATURVEDI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Janet L. Andres	1646
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n:
(1) <u>Janet L. Andres</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Michael Badia</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>15 April 2004</u>	Time: <u>14:00</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	olicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1,2,4 Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ 	The examiner will provide a re record of the substance or	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
11h/1		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	ant/Annlicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)
(Applica	annahhinganra izehi esenigri	vo orginature – ir appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed that claims 1, 2, and 4 would be amended to more clearly refer to the IMPDH inhibitor VX-148. It was agreed that claims 1 and 2 would be amended to remove language describing optimal compositions because, while it is clear that the composition has been optimized by one set of standards, it is unclear as to what other forms of optimization might be employed to generate and optimal compound.